

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 12 and 27 are pending. In the Action mailed on March 24, 2006 the Examiner took the following action: (1) objected to the drawings; (2) rejected claims 1-2, 4 and 12 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph; (3) rejected claims 1-2, 4, 12, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,729,379 to Dragovic (Dragovic), and rejected claims 1-2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,566,924 to Hara et al (Hara). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### *I. Drawings*

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) stating that "[t]he drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "separation component" as claimed in claim 1 must be shown or the feature canceled from the claim(s).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a plurality of dimples or ridges" instead of "separation component". "Plurality of dimples" and "ridges" finds support in the drawings and the specification. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

*II. 35 U.S.C. 112*

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-2, 4 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly, point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In specific, the Examiner presents that "Claim 1 is rejected as being unclear as to whether 'the second portion of the utility bracket' alone or in combination with 'a second portion of the support structure'? (combination)". Claim 1 has been amended to address this rejection. Claims 2, 4 and 12 depend upon claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2, 4 and 12.

*III. 35 U.S.C. 102*

Claims 1-2, 4, 12 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent no. 6,195,811 to Dragovic (Dragovic); and Claims 1-2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 4,566,924 to Hara et al (Hara).

Independent claim 1 has been amended and recites the element "wherein the plurality of dimples or ridges maintains separation by a predefined amount throughout a process of adhering the second portion to the support structure, and wherein the size of the plurality of dimples or ridges is based on an amount of adhesive used in the process of adhering the second portion to the support structure."

Neither Dragovic nor Hara teach or disclose that dimples or ridges are sized based on an amount of adhesive used in adhering a second portion to a support structure. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is allowable over either Dragovic or Hara, or any combinations that include either reference. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 2, 4, and 12 depend from claim 1, and at the least, are allowable based on the arguments presented in support of claim 1. Accordingly, dependent claims 2, 4, and 12 are allowable over either Dragovic or Hara, or any combinations that include either reference.

Independent claim 27 has been amended and recites language similar to claim 1, and specifically "wherein the second portion includes a plurality of dimples configured to separate the second portion from the support structure by a predefined constant amount throughout a process of adhering the second portion to the support structure, and wherein the size of the plurality of dimples is based on an amount of adhesive used in the process of adhering the second portion to the support structure".

As discussed above, neither Dragovic nor Hara teach or disclose that dimples are sized based on an amount of adhesive used in adhering a second portion to a support structure. Accordingly, independent claim 27 is allowable over either Dragovic or Hara, or any combinations that include either reference. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 27.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submit that pending claims 1-2, 4, 12 and 27 are now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining matters that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: 6/23/06

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 

Emmanuel A. Rivera  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Reg. No. 45,760  
(509) 324-9256, ext. 245

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER